

CVPIA Fiscal Year 2008 Annual Work Plan

November 2, 2007

Program Title

Habitat Restoration Program – CVPIA Section 3406(b)(1) “other”

Responsible Entities

Staff Name	Agency	Role
John Thomson	BOR	Lead
Caroline Prose	FWS	Co-Lead

Program Goals and Objectives for FY 2008

The Habitat Restoration Program (HRP) places an emphasis on certain kinds of activities considered more effective and critical to species’ protection and recovery than others. Accordingly, HRP funds are prioritized as they are applied to proposals. The following conservation actions are reflected in the Tasks, Costs, Schedules and Deliverables table, and are in order of priority:

- Task 1.6, Land Acquisition (Fee Title or Conservation Easements (about 45% of funds):
Protection of species or existing habitats impacted by the CVP through the purchase of fee title or conservation easements on lands where threats to these lands are significant.
- Task 1.4, Habitat Restoration (about 25%): Restoration of CVP-impacted habitats where restoration actions will markedly improve conditions for CVP-impacted species.
- Task 1.5, Research (about 20% of funds): Research addressing status, habitat needs, and behavior of CVP-impacted species that will facilitate species recovery.
- Task 1.7, Outreach/Planning/Other (about 10% of funds): Public outreach and education, formulation of land management plans, and other activities that generally contribute to improving conditions for CVP-impacted species and habitats.

The objectives shown below reflect priorities for Fiscal Year 2008 (FY 2008), as well as the overall goals of the program. Meeting these objectives is accomplished through funding the conservation actions shown above, which are used to improve conditions for federally listed CVP impacted species, while recognizing that a balanced set of actions is needed. Our objectives for FY 2008 are as follows:

1. Protect and restore native habitats impacted by the CVP that are not specifically addressed in the Fish and Wildlife Restoration Activities section of the CVPIA.
The focus in 2008, as in years past, will be on habitats known to have experienced the greatest percentage decline in habitat quantity and quality since construction of the CVP,

where such decline could be attributed to the CVP (based on direct and indirect loss of habitat from CVP facilities and use of CVP water). Habitat loss and fragmentation due to urbanization and agriculture conversion are the primary impacts of CVP construction, as analyzed and documented in recent biological opinions related to CVP water operations, as well as the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for the CVPIA. These habitats include riparian, wetlands (e.g., seasonal, permanent), foothill chaparral, alkali desert scrub, grassland, conifer forest, valley-foothill hardwood, vernal pools, and serpentine.

2. Stabilize and improve populations of native species impacted by the CVP that are not specifically addressed in the Fish and Wildlife Restoration Activities section of the CVPIA.

Focus will be given to federally listed, proposed, or candidate species, other non-listed State and Federal species of special concern including migratory birds and other native wildlife species associated with the habitat types listed above. Examples of the latter include native herptofauna associated with riparian and/or valley-foothill hardwood habitat throughout the Central Valley, native raptor species dependent upon valley-foothill hardwood and grassland for nesting and foraging, and neotropical species that use riparian corridors for migration, nesting, and foraging.

3. Establish Measurable Outcomes Related to Biological Objectives. At this time, the HRP does not have identified and quantifiable performance goals in place. We are attempting to establish measurable outcome objectives, but have not yet reached consensus on the approach. Therefore, in FY 2008, the HRP Program Managers will continue to pursue establishment of “Measurable Outcomes.” This objective will seek to better correlate the relationship of the HRP to CVP impacts, and to refine assessment of whether HRP actions are addressing those impacts.

The source documents that support objectives # 2 and #3 include: the Biological Opinion on Implementation of the CVPIA and Continued Operation and Maintenance of the CVP (USFWS 2000); various water contract renewals (e.g., Implementation of the CVPIA and Continued Operation and Maintenance of the CVP (USFWS 2004); Interim Renewal of Specific CVP Water Service Contracts from March 2001 to February 2002 (USFWS 2004); and Interim Water Contract Renewal for March 1, 2004 through February 28, 2006 (USFWS 2004); and the Final CVPIA Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (USFWS and USBR 1999).

Status of the Program

Since the HRP commenced in FY 1996, it has consistently funded many important projects for federally listed CVP-impacted species; maintained excellent leveraging of funds; greatly improved and refined species and habitat priorities and focus of the program; and sustained a low overhead rate.

The HRP has funded 89 new projects with a total budget of \$23,477,865. In accordance with the *Biological Opinion on Implementation of the CVPIA and Continued Operation and Maintenance of the CVP* (USFWS 2000), and various water contract renewals (e.g., *Implementation of the CVPIA and Continued Operation and Maintenance of the CVP* (USFWS 2004); *Interim Renewal of Specific CVP Water Service Contracts from March 2001 to February 2002* (USFWS 2004); and *Interim Water Contract Renewal for March 1, 2004 through February 28, 2006* (USFWS 2004) the USFWS and USBR annually request that adequate funding be allocated to the HRP to protect and enhance ecosystems of listed species and support recovery of listed species. The HRP typically receives approximately \$1.5 million annually, although the Final CVPIA Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) estimated that annual costs of the program would be \$2 million (USFWS and USBR 1999). A variety of actions funded through the HRP have contributed to implementing actions recommended in recovery plans for numerous species including the following: San Joaquin kit fox, giant kangaroo rat, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, California red-legged frog, giant garter snake, bay-checkerspot butterfly, valley elderberry longhorn beetle, riparian brush rabbit, riparian woodrat, vernal pools species, and Gabbro soil plants.

The HRP has contributed funds which have been used to protect over 100,000 acres of habitat for listed, proposed, and candidate species and species of special concern, through acquisition of fee title or conservation easement. Habitats protected include vernal pool, riparian, alkali scrub, foothill chaparral, valley-foothill hardwood, and grassland. The HRP has also funded 8 riparian restoration projects which have contributed to over 1,000 acres being restored. Additionally, the HRP has funded listed species surveys, genetic research, and construction of a captive reproduction facility for the critically endangered riparian brush rabbit. Other projects include funding habitat restoration at the Colusa National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) and Sacramento River NWR, and giant garter snake survey and trapping efforts at the Colusa NWR, San Luis NWR, and Grassland Water District. These efforts contribute to the recovery of CVP impacted listed species. For example, riparian restoration projects include high density elderberry plantings. These plantings are likely to raise baseline conditions for the valley elderberry longhorn beetle. Riparian vegetation at several locations (e.g., Llano Seco) has experienced about an 80% survival rate since being planted for restoration. In addition, wetland restoration at Colusa NWR has resulted in increased populations of giant garter snake, according to ongoing surveys funded by the HRP.

Surveys for the San Joaquin kit fox, giant garter snake, California red-legged frog, yellow-billed cuckoo, riparian brush rabbit, Buena Vista lake shrew, and riparian woodrat, have provided valuable data on the distribution of these species and their habitat requirements. This information will be used to contribute towards the recovery of these species.

The program continues to emphasize the importance of partnering. The level of project partnering is considered during proposal ranking. Since the program began implementation in 1996, at least 85 percent or more of HRP projects have received substantial funding from

numerous conservation partners, including The Nature Conservancy, Ducks Unlimited, River Partners, local land trusts, State and Federal agencies, and CALFED.

Program Managers have continued to improve and refine the focus of the HRP. In FY 2006, managers developed a GIS based, "Project Priority Area Map" which is available via the HRP website to project proponents. This map helps direct conservation actions into high priority areas while also assisting applicants in developing a competitive proposal. Managers have also developed and updated a "High Priority Species List" to accompany the project map. This list is also available on the HRP website and will help guide project actions.

Finally, the relatively low overhead rates used by the HRP (see "Budget Breakout" table) continues to allow the Program Managers to provide more "on-the-ground" funding of projects and less program administration and overhead costs.

FY 2007 Accomplishments

Described below are the eight conservation actions that the HRP funded in FY 2007 at a cost of \$1,147,636. Program administration and overhead costs totaled \$352,364. Three of these actions provided additional funding to continue projects that were initiated in previous years.

The five actions that were new to the HRP in FY 2007 are as follows:

1. Funds (\$165,461) were provided to Antioch Dunes NWR, located in Contra Costa County, for a project that would entail captive propagation of the Lange's metalmark butterfly at the Beckman Center for Conservation Research, and restoration of dune habitat for the butterfly, Contra Costa wallflower, and Antioch Dunes evening primrose.
2. Funds (\$61,126) were provided to UC Davis for a study in Glenn, Colusa, Sacramento, Butte and Solano counties that will: (a) increase successful restoration and creation of vernal pool habitats by examining role of soil biota in plant growth and establishment; (b) compare effects of soil biota sampled from natural pools and from artificial or restored pools on common and endangered vernal pool plant ssp; and (c) examine effects of mycorrhizal inoculation on pollinator visitation to vernal pool species to benefit numerous listed species.
3. Funds (\$43,600) were provided to the Tulare Basin Wildlife Partners (TBWP) to prepare a Riparian-Wildlife Corridor Conservation Plan (CP) and Outreach Plan. Specifically, TBWP will (a) prepare the plan for the riparian-wildlife corridors in Tulare Basin; (b) compile a summary of this plan and the Goose Lake CP, Sand Ridge-Tulare Lake CP; and (c) develop and implement an outreach plan to present conservation planning information to important partners and stakeholders in Tulare, Kern, Kings and Fresno counties.
4. Funds (\$250,000) were provided to River Partners for riparian restoration on 117 acres on the San Joaquin River NWR in Stanislaus County. The project would benefit the riparian brush rabbit, least Bell's vireo, and valley elderberry longhorn beetle.
5. Funds (\$33,356) were provided to the Endangered Species Recovery Program (ESRP) to

assess the success of a relocation effort in Tulare County for the Tipton kangaroo rat.

The three continuing actions for FY 2007 are as follows:

6. Funds (\$157,655) were provided to Eric Hansen, Biological Consultant, for a continuation of
a
study begun in FY 2006 to assess the current status and distribution of giant garter snakes in Merced County and northern Fresno County.
7. Funds (\$64,294) were provided to UC Davis for a continuation of work begun in FY 2006 on the range-wide population genetic structure of GGS. Primary goals are to: (a) expand range-wide studies by incorporating samples from sites in the SJ Basin and Delta; (b) increase number of individuals in SJ populations; and (c) use the Natomas Basin to examine connectivity and fragmentation of populations separated by major highways.
8. Funds (\$372,144) were provided to the Tuolumne River Trust for the acquisition of the 1,603-acre Dos Rios Ranch located in Stanislaus County. The acquisition would protect the riparian corridor, establish a riparian brush rabbit colony on site, provide habitat for the riparian woodrat, and protect floodplain values and compatible agricultural uses. Other species to benefit are the least Bell's vireo and valley elderberry longhorn beetle. In FY 2006, funds were provided by the HRP to help with the planning/surveying/appraisal phase of the project.

Tasks, Costs, Schedules and Deliverables

Task or Subtask Number	Name of Activity	FTE's	Description of Activity	Completion Date	Total Cost	Funding Source RF	Funding Source WRR
1.1	Program Management						
1.1.1	BOR	0.32	Bureau of Reclamation (BOR). Program management incorporates, at a minimum, the following: interdisciplinary approach; competitive process for soliciting for proposals; high integration with the CVP Conservation Program; focus on protecting, restoring, and enhancing federally listed species and habitats, which were directly or indirectly affected by the CVP; contribution towards priority recovery actions; funding based on established priorities; etc. Responsible for all aspects of program management including: obtaining annual priorities from Service Field Office, soliciting for proposals on Grants.gov, reviewing and ranking proposals, conducting site reviews, selecting projects to fund, writing Agreements, providing oversight on all funded projects, and coordinating technical team.	9/30/08	\$52,500 BOR	\$52,500 BOR	\$0
	<u>Subtotal Costs</u>			9/30/08	\$52,500	\$52,500	\$0
1.2	Program Support						
1.2.1	FWS	1.06	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). Program management activities are the same as in section 1.1.1 shown above.	9/30/08	\$195,939 FWS	\$195,939 FWS	\$0
	<u>Subtotal Costs</u>				\$195,939	\$195,939	\$0
1.3	Technical Support		(also includes contracting support, environmental documentation, and appraisal review)				
1.3.1	BOR	0.39	Support person #1 - Environmental Specialist, BOR. Responsible for writing environmental compliance documents for projects selected for funding.	9/30/08	\$46,723 – BOR (total support)	\$46,723 - BOR (total support)	\$0
			Support person #2 - Budget Analyst, BOR. Responsible for processing all contracts.	9/30/08			
			Support person #3 - Grants & Cooperative Agreements Officer. Responsible for responding to all grant & cooperative agreement issues and questions that arise; posting RFP on www.Grants.gov; etc.	9/30/08			

Task or Subtask Number	Name of Activity	FTE's	Description of Activity	Completion Date	Total Cost	Funding Source RF	Funding Source WRR
	FWS	.08	Support person #1-Cooperative Agreement Specialist, Service. Responsible for processing all contracts.	9/30/08	\$16,182 –FWS (total support)	\$16,182 – FWS (total support)	\$0
			Support person #2- Staff Biologist, Service. Responsible for writing environmental compliance documents for projects selected for funding.	9/30/08			\$0
	<u>Subtotal Costs</u>				\$62,905 FWS/BOR	\$62,905 FWS/BOR	\$0
1.4	Restoration Actions						
1.4.1				9/30/08	\$297,164 - BOR/FWS	\$297,164- BOR/FWS	\$0
	<u>Subtotal Costs</u>				\$297,164 - BOR/FWS	\$297,164- BOR/FWS	
1.5	Evaluations Studies Investigations Research						
1.5.1				9/30/08	\$237,731 - BOR/FWS	\$237,731 - BOR/FWS	\$0
	<u>Subtotal Costs</u>				\$237,731 - BOR/FWS	\$237,731 - BOR/FWS	
1.6	Land - Water - and - Conveyance - Acquisitions						
1.6.1				9/30/08	\$534,895 - BOR/FWS	\$534,895 - BOR/FWS	\$0
	<u>Subtotal Costs</u>				\$534,895 - BOR/FWS	\$534,895 - BOR/FWS	
1.7	Other: Outreach and Public Involvement/ Planning/Manag						

Task or Subtask Number	Name of Activity	FTE's	Description of Activity	Completion Date	Total Cost	Funding Source RF	Funding Source WRR
	ement						
1.7.1				9/30/08	\$118,866 - BOR/FWS	\$118,866 - BOR/FWS	\$0
	<u>Subtotal Costs</u>				\$118,866 - BOR/FWS	\$118,866 - BOR/FWS	
	Total Costs		Program Management Total Costs		\$52,500 - BOR	\$195,939 - FWS	\$0
			Technical Support Total Costs		\$46,723 - BOR	\$16,182 - FWS	\$0
			Project Funding and Implementation Total Costs		\$650,777 -BOR	\$537,879 - FWS	\$0
			TOTAL		\$750,000 - BOR	\$750,000 - FWS	\$0

Explanatory Notes (for Table D and “Budget Breakout” table): All costs are estimates; actual costs will be determined subsequent to the proposal solicitation and review process. 1 FTE = \$208,107.90 for USFWS/SFWO for FY 2008 (Environmental Compliance); 1 FTE = \$151,515 USFWS/CNO (Program Management); variable FTE rate is applied to USBR estimates. USBR costs were increased by 5% from FY 2007. For USFWS, Program Management and Environmental Compliance Admin. Costs are calculated as 22% of the Total Costs for that category; for USFWS, Contract and Grant Costs are calculated as 6% of Total Costs for that category; for USBR, Direct Salary & Benefits Costs are calculated as 61% of Total Costs for that category; for USBR, Admin. Costs for Environmental Compliance and Appraisal Review are calculated as 39% of Total Costs for that category; for USBR, Admin. Costs for Contract and Grant Costs are calculated as 1% of Contract Costs. Of the total of \$1,115,470 for Total Contract and Grants Costs, Restoration Tasks were calculated at 25% of Total Costs for that category; Research Tasks were calculated at 20% of Total Costs for that category; Acquisition Tasks were calculated at 45% of Total Costs for that category; and Outreach Tasks were calculated at 10% of Total Costs for that category.

CVPIA Program Budget

Budget Breakout

Task	Agency	FTE	Direct Salary and Benefits Costs	Contract and Grant Costs	Misc. Costs	Admin Costs	Total Costs
1.1 Program Management	FWS	1.06	\$160,606	\$0	\$0	\$35,333	\$195,939
	BOR	0.32	\$31,818	\$0	\$0	\$20,682	\$52,500
1.2 Program Support	FWS	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	BOR	0.27	\$11,453	\$0	\$0	\$7,445	\$18,898
1.3 Technical Support	FWS	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	BOR	0	\$5,728	\$0	\$0	\$3,723	\$9,451
1.4 Restoration Actions	FWS	0	\$0	\$126,858	\$0	\$7,612	\$134,470
	BOR	0	\$0	\$161,083	\$0	\$1,611	\$162,694
1.5 Evaluations, Studies, Investigations, Research	FWS	0	\$0	\$101,487	\$0	\$6,089	\$107,576
	BOR	0	\$0	\$128,866	\$0	\$1,289	\$130,155
1.6 Land, Water and Conveyance Acquisitions	FWS	0	\$0	\$228,345	\$0	\$13,701	\$242,046
	BOR	0	\$0	\$289,951	\$0	\$2,899	\$292,850
1.7 Outreach and Public Involvement	FWS	0	\$0	\$50,743	\$0	\$3,045	\$53,788
	BOR	0	\$0	\$64,434	\$0	\$644	\$65,078
1.9 Environmental Compliance	FWS	0.08	\$13,264	\$0	\$0	\$2,918	\$16,182
	BOR	0.12	\$11,136	\$0	\$0	\$7,238	\$18,374
FWS Total Costs		1.14	\$173,870	\$507,433		\$68,698	\$750,000
BOR Total Costs		0.71	\$60,135	\$644,334		\$45,531	\$750,000
Total		1.85	\$234,005	\$1,151,767		\$114,229	\$1,500,000

Five Year Budget Plan

DRAFT CVPIA 5-Year Budget Plan FY 2009 – 2013

(\$ thousands)

Funding Source	FY 2009 (90% increase from \$1.5 m)	FY 2010 (90% increase from \$1.5 m)	FY 2011 (100% increase from \$1.5 m)	FY 2012 (100% increase from \$1.5 m)	FY 2013 (110% increase from \$1.5 m)	Total
W&RR	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
RF	\$2,850,000	\$2,850,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,150,000	\$14,850,000
State	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other (identify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$2,850,000	\$2,850,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,150,000	\$14,850,000

Note: The FY 2007 – 2013 Budget Plan provides estimates of capability only. The W&RR Appropriations are

displayed as amounts that might be reasonably appropriated each year. These figures do not reflect the future Congressional Appropriations process. All of these estimates will be adjusted annually as RF collections are realized.

The major activities by year are the same for each year:

- Program management (obtaining annual priorities from Service Field Office; soliciting for proposals on www.Grants.gov; reviewing and ranking proposals; conducting site reviews; selecting projects to fund; writing Coop./Grant Agreements; providing oversight on all funded projects; and coordinating technical team).
- Protection, restoration, and enhancement of federally listed species and habitats.
- Contribution towards priority recovery actions.

LITERATURE CITED

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2000. Biological Opinion on Implementation of the CVPIA and Continued Operation and Maintenance of the CVP. Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office, Sacramento, California.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2004. Biological Opinion, Interim Water Contract Renewal Consultation for the Period March 1, 2004 through February 28, 2006. Sacramento, California.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Bureau of Reclamation. 1999. Central Valley Project Improvement Act, Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. Page II-42, Table II-10. Sacramento, California.